

## **Remarks**

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed February 26, 2007. A Petition for Extension of Time to Respond is submitted, together with the appropriate fee.

### **I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections**

Claims 4-8 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4-8.

Claims 5 and 7 were objected to as being unclear to the Examiner.

Claims 4-8 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 of copending Application No. 10/784,559.

Claims 4-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to nonstatutory subject matter.

Claims 4-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Claims 4-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bogle et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,353,923).

### **II. Summary of Applicants' Response**

The claims were amended to better define embodiments of Applicants' invention, amending claim 4, canceling claims 5-8, and adding new claims 9-17, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 4 and 9-17. A drawing was added and the specification was amended in

response to the Examiner's objections, but no new matter is added. A Terminal Disclaimer is attached to overcome the rejection for non-statutory double patenting.

### III. Information Disclosure Statement

The Office Action stated that the IDS received 12/12/2006 was not considered because it lacked a statement under 37 C.F.R. 1.97(c). However, 37 C.F.R. 1.97(c) provides that an IDS will be considered by the Office if either a statement is provided under 37 C.F.R. 1.97(c) or the fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. 1.17(p) is paid. In this case, the fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. 1.17(p) was paid.

Applicants are citing additional references in an IDS submitted together with this Reply, and have included the previously unconsidered references in the current IDS.

### IV. Response to 35 U.S.C. 102(c) Rejection

Claim 4 (as amended) states:

A method for debugging in more than one programming language with a multi-language debugger, comprising:  
debugging a source code file which contains multiple nested languages;  
interpreting multiple nested languages within a single source file and displaying each of the multiple nested languages in a debugging frame;  
editing each language in a debugging frame; and  
wherein the multi-language debugger uses a standardize interface for a script engine and all communications with the script engine will be through calls to a script debug controller.

Claim 4 defines a method for debugging a source code file which contains multiple nested languages.

Bogle teaches an active debugging environment for debugging a virtual application that contains program language code from multiple compiled and interpreted languages. Bogle's focus is on debugging a virtual application that has components from several programming languages. Bogle's invention does not appear to be intended to address the same problem that Applicants faced, namely debugging a single source code file with multiple interpreted and compiled languages nested within one another. Bogle's invention dealt with debugging multiple languages in one application, not in debugging multiple nested languages in one source file. While there are some similarities in the solutions developed by Bogle and Applicants, the fact that they had different problems to solve resulted in different inventions.

Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment as defined in Independent Claim 4 is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of Bogle. For at least the reasons discussed above with regard to Claim 4, dependent Claims 9-17 are also patentable. Dependent claims 9-17 add their own features which render them patentable in their own right.

V. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including today, June 20, 2007.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 20, 2007

By: /Thomas K. Plunkett/  
Thomas K. Plunkett  
Reg. No. 57,253

Customer No. 23910  
FLIESLER MEYER LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94108  
Telephone: (415) 362-3800